

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated September 8, 2006 and the Advisory Action dated December 5, 2006. Claims 26-65 are currently pending. Claims 1-25 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 26, 31-35, 37-39, 41, and 42 have been amended. Claims 47-65 are new. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added with the amendments to the claims and the new claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in the Office Action and Advisory Action as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,909, issued to Logan et al. ("*Logan*"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over *Logan*.

Amended claim 26 recites receiving a notice of a change to a rotation set, transmitting a request for a page containing changed data in response to a notice, and receiving a page containing changed data. *Logan* does not teach receiving a notice of a change to a rotation set, transmitting a request for a page containing changed data in response to a notice, and receiving a page containing changed data. Instead *Logan* teaches receiving a URL request and searching the transition control list to determine if the received URL request contains a URL which matches a trailing URL on the list, and if so, first displaying the page identified by the URL in the leading field (*Logan*, column 26-31). Accordingly, claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Independent claim 42 recites limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitations of claim 26 discussed above. Accordingly, for reasons stated above in connection with claim 26, claim 42 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 16, 17, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in the Office Action and the Advisory Action as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0046299 filed by

Lefeber et al. ("*Lefeber*") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0016839 filed by Smith et al. ("*Smith*"). Claims 1, 16, 17, 24, and 25 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 2-11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith* in further view of *Logan*. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Smith* and *Logan* in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0039776 filed by Ballard ("*Ballard*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,985,950 issued to Hanson et al. ("*Hanson*"). Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Smith*, and *Logan* in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0078134 filed by Stone et al. ("*Stone*"). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith*, in further view of *Ballard* and *Hanson*. Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith* et al. in further view of *Ballard*. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Smith* in further view of *Ballard* and *Logan*. Claims 2-15, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21-23 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 28 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in further view of *Stone*. For the reasons stated above in connection with independent claims 26 and 42, the claims are allowable over *Logan*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Stone* of the missing elements discussed above. Accordingly, claims 28 and 46 are allowable for at least the reasons stated above in conjunction with claims 26 and 42.

Claims 31, 32 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,187 issued to Jeyarman et al. ("*Jeyarman*"). Claims 33, 34, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0084124 filed by Su et al. ("*Su*") and *Logan*. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further review of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0005129 filed by Scheinkman ("*Sheinkman*"). Claims 38 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further view of SearchSecurity.com ("*SearchSecurity*"). Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber* and *Jeyarman* in further view of *Ballard*.

Independent claim 31 recites at least one server adapted to receive a request for a page containing changed data and generate the requested page and at least one display device adapted to receive a rotation set comprising a list identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence, transmit a request for a page containing changed data, and receive a page containing changed data. *Lefebvre* does not teach at least one server adapted to receive a request for a page containing changed data and generate the requested page and at least one display device adapted to receive a rotation set comprising a list identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence, transmit a request for a page containing changed data, and receive a page containing changed data. Instead, *Lefebvre* teaches sending an alert to a device and concurrently sending an instruction to a webserver that any requests for a user-specified URL are to be automatically redirected to a webpage crafted by the network (*Lefebvre*, paragraph 0066). In addition, for at least the reasons stated above in connection with independent claim 26, claim 31 and its dependent claims are allowable over *Logan*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in the additional cited references of the missing elements discussed above. Accordingly, claims 31-41 are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

A Petition for One Month Extension of Time and a Request for Continued Examination are being filed concurrently with this Reply to Advisory Action of December 8, 2006. The required fee in the amount of \$790.00 for filing a Request for Continued Examination and the required fee in the amount of \$120.00 for filing a Petition for One Month Extension of Time are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. If any additional extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any other required charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 8, 2007

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

PTO Customer No. 26230
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street
Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091